In the Court of the Sub. Division Officer Chickballapur.

Rev: Suit No. 6 of 1892-93

Plaintiffs

1 Hanumanta Row

2. Kesava Row.

Defendt:

Ramappa.

Dated Feb. 1893.

Plaint.

(1) Ramanna was the elder brother of the 1st Plaintiff. This man's son is the 2d Plaintiff. These individuals are un-divided.

(2) The Huk & the Shanboge of Pura & Minakanakunte of Mumbinahalli hobli of Gowbidnur Taluk, formerly of Chickballapur Taluk, had been enjoyed by the Plaintiffs along with Inam lands and Mirasi ~~[illegible]~~ ~~[illegible]~~ having been acquired by their ancestors.

(3) Vyasa Row the grand father of the 1st plaintiff and great grand father of the 2d ~~[illegible]~~ was the original Registerdar & these villages, did & enjoying Inam lands Mirasi. after his [illegible] Krishnappa father [illegible] 1st and grand fa[illegible] effect.

the 2d plaintiff was the
Registrar and office holder.
after his son, Ramanna
the elder brother of the
1st defendant and father
of the 2d was the Registra-
dar and office holder.
after his death the Dy.
Commr. directed the 1st
plaintiff to be appointed
to both the villages. The
1st plaintiff was given
the accounts of the village
and was enjoying
the inam lands and minai
but was not given the
accounts and papers
relating to Minakana
Gurke - He has however
been enjoying the inam lands
and minai.

(4) For Minakanakurki
there were two Shanbogues &
two sets of accounts were
being prepared. The plaintiffs
ancestors were doing duties
along with one Ramappa.
Ramappa being ignorant
of accounts the 1st plaintiffs
father was solely perform-
ing the duties. Ramappa
died leaving a widower
and issueless. At that
time the defendant was
sent on him for
As at that time the

P.F. 47 of 94
G. R. S. IX-5]

Previous references.

1894-95
192 .
(L.R.)

File No. 117 of 94
Serial Nos. 1-11

Later references.

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

Serial Nos. 1 — 11

Refer ~~Part~~ B for September 1895

SUBJECT.

Appeal of Hanumantha Rao and his sister to Kesava Rao regarding ~~the~~ Shanbhogi of Hin Kanjarki, Ajai bidnur Taluk.

Recommended not

Indexed
Ro.

WD 2233 GPB—20,000—14-6-20

3

1st Plaintiff was absent from the place and the 2nd a minor the defendant himself was performing the duties. The defendant is no kinsman of Narnappa nor has he any right to look after the Shanbogi of the village.

(5) The plaintiffs ~~made~~ from time to time requested the Taluk authorities ~~that the~~ as in accordance with the Dy. Commrs' orders that the accounts of Minikanakatte ~~kakka~~ Taluk ~~Kashin~~ ~~immediately~~ may be taken back from the Defendant & delivered over to Plaintiffs but the Taluk authorities invariably put off compliance. When they represented the matter to the Dy. Commr, 4 others, they received orders No. 682 dated 18.3.93 that this cannot be done; and Taluk orders on 14.4.93. The cause of action arose here.

The plaintiffs pray for judgment to the following

effect

1. That as the defendant is not the heir to ~~deceased~~ Karnappa for performing the Shanbogi duties of Minakanakunte, that his ~~hak~~ be rejected, the appellants' hak established, & the accounts transferred from the defendant to the plaintiffs to enable them to perform the duties.

2. That the plaintiffs be given any other relief which the court may think proper, & the costs be charged to defendant – Hanumantha

(Signed) Kesava Rao

Translation

SKR

Written ~~statement~~ statement of the defendant.

1. As Shanbogue Karnappa of Minakanagunte had no issues, he had ~~taken~~ brought the defendant, his grandson to his ~~own~~ house when he (defdt) was a boy, brought him up, got his Upanayanam performed and adopted him,

5

The defendant is thus the adopted son of Narnappa and not the latter's dependant for food.

2. Narnappa and his ancestors are the Stal registered Shanbogues of Minakuna-kunte village. The ancestors of the Plaintiffs were the Sircar Shanbogues. When Bara Namune accounts came to force that is 20 years ago, they lost the appointment and the Stal Shanbogue Narnappa was confirmed & was performing duties.

(3) Narnappa having died in Bhahudanya I have been registered & performing duties.

(4) During the survey & settlement Jamabundy fotige was sanctioned to the defendant and he has been ever since receiving it. Moreover the defendant is in possession of Inam lands bearing an assess-ment of Rs 91-"-"

Plaintiffs have never enjoyed it. Plaintiffs have in their possession Inams bearing an

Assessment

7

(5)

Appeal No. 4 of 1894-95

Aplt.
Hanumantarow
Kesavarow,
of Husa
Zombaddaner Taluq
represented by
Mr Ramaswamy
Iyer —

Respdt
Ramappa

Appellant brought a suit for the recovery of the office of Shanbog of Minkinguski from the Respdt & the suit was dismissed [both in the Court of first instance & in the lower appellate Court] on the ground that it was barred by the Law of Limitation. The appeal is against this Decree.

Appellant's contention: that the ~~question of limitation~~ [suit is] ~~does not arise in this case~~ [not barred], as he was enjoying the [service] Inam attached to the office

of Serkar Shanbhogi

up to the Potagi

~~settlement which took~~

place in 1888, ~~as that~~ He however admits

his suit was not for

the recovery of the

Stala Shanbhogi which

belongs to the Respdt

but for the establishment

of his right to office

as the former Serkar Shanbhog.

If this is ~~really~~ the

contention, there is no

cause of action against

the Respdt. ~~Priority was~~ the office was given to applts as they were

~~given to~~ the Stala Shanbhogs

under Govt order dated

7th March 1878 No 10699 / 2291

& ~~the Income of the applts~~

~~was ordered to be separated~~

If the applts ~~are~~ consider

themselves aggrieved, their

remedy is a Petition

6

assessment of Rs 25-8-"

(5) The Plaintiffs lost their right long ago. There is only one Dafedar to the village and the Defendant's father Narnappa & latterly the defendant have been performing the duties. Therefore Plaintiffs' right is barred by limitation.

(6) The Plaintiffs are not entitled to the relief sought in Para 1 of Column 6 of the plaint. The suit should be dismissed with costs

10.7.93. (Signed) Ramappa Shanbhog

Translation.

10

Second appeal in a regular suit

In time
Stamp sufficient
Issue notice to both parties
Call for lower proceedings.
Posted to 20 September

[illegible] 7/8

[illegible]
11/8 [illegible]

L.R. 119-94-1

(General Serial No. 32.)

1894.

(2)

No. 318

Name of Petitioner. Hanumantha Rao & Keshava Rao, Shanbhogs of Inam Kamagurike

Village. Hura

Taluk. Gowribidnoor

District. Kolar

Date of Arzi. 23-7-94

Date of Receipt. 27-7-94

Date of Disposal.

No. of Enclosures. ~~Two~~. Three

ABSTRACT.

Appeal against the judgment of the Deputy Commissioner, Kolar Dt., in Revenue Case No: of 1893-94, dated 20-6-94, on the following grounds:-

1. That the suit is not barred by Limitation for the following reasons:-

(a). The cause for action happened in 1888 when the Respt. failed to give shares to the Appellants out of the Potgi amount & not in 1879 when the Respt. took charge of the office, for the appellants were enjoying the inam lands till 1888 when they were assessed fully & Potgi was granted instead as remuneration for the work. So the suit is not barred according to 124th Article, 2nd Schedule of the Limitation Act.

(b) That 2nd Appellant was a minor when his father died in 1876. He attained his majority in 1882 & calculating from that date, the suit is within 12 years.

(c) The Appellants had petitioned on the subject to the Deputy Commissioner in 1888, to which they received an order in 1892, that they should file a Regular Suit & so this delay of 4 years should be subtracted in reckoning the time

2 That the appellants are not deprived of their hak to the Shanbhoge office in any way & so the Respts. has no greater claims for the office

That the Respts. first represented that he was the 1st son of Narayappa & then after the filing of the suit he deposed that he was the adopted son, this the Lower Court didn't accept. So he cannot be a Karadar to Narayappa only on the ground that he was looking after the duties for about 12 or 13 years when the suit was pending.

4. That the decisions of the Lower Courts cause not only loss to the Govt., but also deprive the Pltrs. of their hak.

Pray that the decisions of the Lower Courts may be cancelled & the petitioners hak may be confirmed

Hak 6/8.

9

to Gunawardana Deut against Respdt. The Deut ~~Court~~ has therefore been properly dismissed ~~though~~ on ~~an incorrect~~ a different ground the appeal is rejected.

25/9/94

(General Serial No. 30.) 2691.

1894. ~~Pet~~ Pet 145

From

The Deputy Commissioner
Kolar District.

(4)

13

To

The Chief Secretary to the Dewan
of Mysore.

Dated 22nd
Despatched 27 } August 1894.
Received

Enclosures No. 4 Record

General No. 766 } 1894-95.
No. 128

His official Memorandum No. Pet/232 dated 13th instant forwarded for submission of proceedings a petition[x] from Hanumantha Row and Kesavath of Minakanagurki, Goribidnore Taluq, appealing against this office decision regarding the Shanbhogi of the village.

As called for in the above, has the honor to submit herewith as per accompanying list the entire proceedings connected with the case.

Trace

[signature]

Deputy Commissioner
Kolar District.

'94

... trans...
(1) plaint
Written Statement } attended to
(2)
(3) issues are in English (vide ...)
(4) Grounds of appeal already translated

SKR 20/9.

8/29/8

L.R. 119-94-3

x Herewith returned with its enclosures.

To the same No. 6887 16-12-94
Pet 47-94

Pet
232

17-8-94

12

(3)

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE.

Petition Department.

OFFICIAL MEMORANDUM.

The accompanying Petition No. 318

dated 23rd July 1894 received at the Dewan's Office from Hanumanta Rao and Keshava Rao of [illegible] [illegible] Taluk appealing against the Dy. Commr's decision regarding the Shanbogi of the village

is forwarded, together with its ~~two~~ three enclosures, to the Dy. Commr Kolar District for submission of the entire proceedings connected with the case so as to reach this office on or before the [illegible]

2. The petition with its enclosures should be returned

L.R. 119-94-12

By Order,

Chief Secretary.

Bangalore,
13 Aug 1894
18.

13/8

M.G.C.P.Bangalore.—3-5-94.—1,000.

From the same No. 66/128 of 22-8-94

1H

(1)

MYSORE COURT FEE

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE.
PETITION DEPARTMENT.
REG'D. No. 318 R
DATE 27-7-94

AS 404 of 94-95

3-11-94

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] 1894-95 [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

1 [illegible]

2 [illegible]

[illegible] 189[illegible] 23 [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] 1892-93 [illegible] 93-94 [illegible]

[illegible]

1 [illegible]

[illegible]

1 [illegible]

1888 [illegible]

[illegible] 1879 [illegible]

[illegible]

1888 [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

125 [illegible]

[illegible] 2 [illegible] 124 [illegible]

Vb

Appeal no 4 of 1894-95

(6)

Appellants

Hammenatha Row
Kesava Row
of Pura, Gonibidanur
Taluq, represented
by Mr Ramasami Iyer

Respondent

Ramappa.

L.R. 119-94-4

Appellants brought a suit for the recovery of the office of Shanbog of Mukenguriki from the Respondent and the suit was dismissed both in the Court of the first instance and in the lower Appellate Court - on the ground that it was barred by Limitation. The Appeal is against this decree. Appellants' Counsel contends that the suit is not barred as they

were enjoying the Service
Inam attached to the
office of Sirkar Shanbog
up to the Patage settlement
which took place in
1888. [illegible] It was
however admitted that the
suit was not for the
recovery of the Stala
Shanabogi but for
the establishment of
their right to the office as
as the former Sirkar
Shanabog. If this is
the contention, there
is no Cause of Action
against the Respondent as the Sirkar Shanbogship [illegible] been done away [illegible] and [illegible] [illegible]
The office was given to
the Respondent as he who
was admitted the Stala Shanabogee, was [illegible] consequent on his hered[illegible]
under Government the orders
communicated in the G.O. No. dated 7 March 1898
No $\frac{10699}{2291}$. If the

Sub[illegible]
This is [illegible]
for the [illegible]
draft [illegible]
28[illegible]



Appeal no 49 1894-95 (8)

Endorsement granted to Hanumantha Row and Kesava Row of Pura, Goribidanur Taluq, in reply to their petition no 318 dated 23rd July 1894 appealing against the decree of the Dy Commr of Kolar in Rev. appeal no 49.93-94 disallowing Petrs' claim for the Shanbogei office of Minikunguruki, Goribidanur Taluq.

L.R. 119-94-5

Petitioners are informed that the decree of the Dy Commr, which is correct, has been confirmed and their appeal dismissed.

Enclosures are returned.

(By order)
[illegible] 22/10
for Chief Secy

[illegible] 4/10

15

18

appellants consider themselves aggrieved, their remedy is petition to Government and not a suit against respondent. The suit has therefore been properly dismissed, though on a different ground. The appeal is rejected.

[illegible] 3/10

for Ch. Secy

No. 6807 / Rev. 47-94 [illegible] 3/11

To the Dy Commr. Kohat with the records received with his No 706/128 dated 22.8.94

[illegible]

for Ch. Secy

[illegible] 12/11/94

[illegible] 16/10

[illegible] 4/10

[illegible]
3-11-94

[illegible] 3/8 20 (7)

L.R. 119-94 /b

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] 93-94 [illegible]

[illegible] 4 [illegible]

[illegible] 23-7-94 [illegible]

[illegible] 3/8 [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

3-11

[illegible]

[illegible]

By order

Draft.

[signature] 31/10

for Chief Secretary

Copy to Recipient.

[illegible]

[signature] 30/10

P. T. Goaole...

21

18/12

Submitted to Council
Application for ...
...
Stamp insufficient

Ulf 19/12

L.R. 119-94-7

You see no
reason for
re-opening the case

8/2/95

Bull
...
Draft
SKR
17/12

PT 1-a.

Gen. Serial No. 32

189

9

No. A 1654

Name of Petitioner. Hanumantharao & Keshavarao

Village. Minakanagurki

Taluk. Gauribidnur

District. Kolar

Date of ...

Date of Receipt.

Date of Disposal. 11-12-94

No. of Enclosures.

8 Rs Stamp

ABSTRACT.

Review application

Applies for the revision of the appeal suit no 47 1894-95

The grounds for review are:—

(1) That at the time of app certain records were not available and that their contention is that the Respondents' right to the office of Shanbogue should be disallowed and their claim established

~~(2) That the ...~~

22

(2) That the period of limitation from 1879 (the date on which the respondent was appointed to the office) to 1888 (the date on which the suit was brought) is within 12 years & therefore the ~~limitation~~ suit time is not barred

) That their right to the office was not disallowed by the Government nor do the petitioners apply for the establishment of such right.

) That the Amildar, in his report no 462 d/19/12/92, says that both the Shanbogues may look after the business of ...nkanpurki on the ground that such a practice existed before and that the order of dismissal of the appeal is contrary to that report

) That the adoption of Respondent ...aranappa is not established

) That the levy of assessment ... the names of the petitioners ...ile clearly show that they (petitioners) have a right to the office

15/12/94



Stamp
25 Eight annas

ಕೋರ್ಟಿಗೆ

ಸನ 1894 ನೇ ಇಸವಿ ಅಕ್ಟೋಬರ್ ತಿಂಗಳ ನಂಬರ್ 4

ಪ್ರತಿವಾದಿ.

ವಾದಿಗಳ

1 ನೇ

2 ನೇ

ಬರೆಸಿ ಕೊಟ್ಟ ಪಕಾಲತ್‌ನಾಮೆ.

ಈ ಮೊಕದ್ದೆಮೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ನನ್ನ ಪರವಾಗಿ ಕೋರ್ಟಿಗೆ ಹಾಜರಾಗಿ ಅರ್ಜಿ ವಗೈರೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟು, ವಿವಾದಿಸಿ ಫೈಸಲ್ ಕೊಂಡತಕ್ಕ ಬಗ್ಗು, ಮತ್ತು ನನಿಗೆ ಸಲ್ಲತಕ್ಕ ಡಿಕರಿ ಮೊಬಲಗು ದಸ್ತಾವಜು ವಗೈರೆ ತೆಗದುಕ್ಕೊಂಡು ಶೀದಿಕೊಡುವದಕ್ಕೂ ಸಹಾ ತಮಗೆ ಅಧಿಕಾರ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದೇನೆ, ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ತಾವು ನನಿಗೋಸ್ಕರ ಕೋರ್ಟಿಗೆ ಹಾಜರಾಗಿ ನಡಿಸುವ ಎಲ್ಲಾ ಕೆಲಸಗಳನ್ನು ನಾನು ಮುದ್ದು ಇದ್ದು ನಡಿಸಿದಂತೆ ಒಪ್ಪುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ತಾರೀಖು 8 ನೇ ಅಕ್ಟೋಬರ್
ಸನ 1894 ನೇ ಇಸವಿ.

ರಾಜು.

ಅಂಗೀಕರಿಸಿ ಇರುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ಈ ವೊಕ್ಕಾ್ಯರ್‌ನಾಮೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟವರು ನನಗೆ ಪರಿಚಯಸ್ಥರು, ನನ್ನ ಸಮಕ್ಷಮ ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ರಜು ಮಾಡಿ ಇದ್ದಾರೆ, ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ನಾನು ಸರ್ಟಿಫೈ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದೇನೆ

COURT FEE
TWO RUPEES

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE
PETITION DEPARTMENT

(10)

No. 1654

L.R. 119-94-8

26

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE,

PETITION DEPARTMENT,

189

Endorsement granted to Hanumanta Rao and Veerana Rao of Menakaguthi Sindhanur Taluk,

in reply to their Petition Registered No. 1554 undated praying for a review of the Govt. decision in A.P. No. 4 of 1894-95 regarding their claim to the Shanbogship of ~~Maska~~ ~~village~~ Menakagutti.

Petitioners are informed that Govt. see no reason for reopening the case.

2. Enclosures are returned.

K.A.
27/2/95

Comniled
S.K.R.
12/2

Draft

"By Order"

K.A. 2/3/95

For Chief Secretary.

M. G. C. P. Bangalore—6-3-94.—2000.

[illegible] 12/2



27

1654.

L.R. 119-94-9

Draft

ಪ್ರಾಥಮಿಕ ಶಾಲೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಕಲಿಯುತ್ತಿದ್ದ ಸಮಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಅವರು ಸಂಸ್ಕೃತ ಭಾಷೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಅಪಾರ ಆಸಕ್ತಿ ಬೆಳೆಸಿಕೊಂಡರು. ಅವರ ಸಂಸ್ಕೃತ ಶಿಕ್ಷಕರಾಗಿದ್ದ ಶ್ರೀ ಕೃಷ್ಣಮೂರ್ತಿ ಶಾಸ್ತ್ರಿಗಳು ಅವರಿಗೆ ಸಂಸ್ಕೃತ ಕಾವ್ಯಗಳ ಸೌಂದರ್ಯವನ್ನು ಪರಿಚಯಿಸಿದರು. ಕಾಳಿದಾಸನ ಕೃತಿಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಅವರಿಗೆ ವಿಶೇಷ ಆಸಕ್ತಿ ಮೂಡಿತು. ಶಾಲೆಯ ವಾರ್ಷಿಕೋತ್ಸವದಲ್ಲಿ ಅವರು ಸಂಸ್ಕೃತ ಶ್ಲೋಕಗಳನ್ನು ಹಾಡಿ ಎಲ್ಲರ ಮೆಚ್ಚುಗೆ ಗಳಿಸಿದರು.

ಪ್ರೌಢಶಾಲೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಅವರು ಸಂಸ್ಕೃತವನ್ನು ಐಚ್ಛಿಕ ವಿಷಯವಾಗಿ ಆಯ್ಕೆ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡರು. ಅಲ್ಲಿ ಅವರು ಅಮರಕೋಶ, ಸಿದ್ಧಾಂತ ಕೌಮುದಿ ಮತ್ತು ಕಾಳಿದಾಸನ ನಾಟಕಗಳನ್ನು ಅಧ್ಯಯನ ಮಾಡಿದರು. ಪರೀಕ್ಷೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಅವರು ಸಂಸ್ಕೃತದಲ್ಲಿ ೯೮ ಅಂಕಗಳನ್ನು ಪಡೆದು ಶಾಲೆಗೆ ಪ್ರಥಮ ಸ್ಥಾನ ಗಳಿಸಿದರು. ಅವರ ಶಿಕ್ಷಕರು ಅವರಿಗೆ ಸಂಸ್ಕೃತ ಪಂಡಿತರಾಗಲು ಪ್ರೋತ್ಸಾಹಿಸಿದರು.

ಕಾಲೇಜಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಅವರು ಸಂಸ್ಕೃತ ಸಾಹಿತ್ಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಪದವಿ ಪಡೆದರು. ಅಲ್ಲಿ ಅವರು ಭಾರವಿಯ ಕಿರಾತಾರ್ಜುನೀಯ ಮತ್ತು ಮಾಘನ ಶಿಶುಪಾಲವಧ ಕಾವ್ಯಗಳನ್ನು ಅಧ್ಯಯನ ಮಾಡಿದರು. ಅವರು ಸಂಸ್ಕೃತ ಕಾವ್ಯಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಅಲಂಕಾರಗಳ ಬಳಕೆಯ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಸಂಶೋಧನೆ ನಡೆಸಿದರು. ಅವರ ಸಂಶೋಧನಾ ಪ್ರಬಂಧವು ಕನ್ನಡ ಸಂಸ್ಕೃತ ಅಧ್ಯಯನ ಪತ್ರಿಕೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಪ್ರಕಟವಾಯಿತು.

ಪದವಿಯ ನಂತರ ಅವರು ಸಂಸ್ಕೃತ ಉಪನ್ಯಾಸಕರಾಗಿ ಕೆಲಸ ಮಾಡಿದರು. ಅವರು ಸುಮಾರು ೨೫ ವರ್ಷಗಳ ಕಾಲ ಸಂಸ್ಕೃತ ಬೋಧಿಸಿದರು. ಅವರ ಅನೇಕ ವಿದ್ಯಾರ್ಥಿಗಳು ಸಂಸ್ಕೃತ ಪಂಡಿತರಾಗಿ ಹೊರಹೊಮ್ಮಿದರು. ಅವರು ಸಂಸ್ಕೃತ ಸಂಘವನ್ನು ಸ್ಥಾಪಿಸಿ ಅದರ ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರಾಗಿ ಸೇವೆ ಸಲ್ಲಿಸಿದರು. ಅವರ ಮಾರ್ಗದರ್ಶನದಲ್ಲಿ ಅನೇಕ ವಿದ್ಯಾರ್ಥಿಗಳು ಪಿಎಚ್.ಡಿ ಪಡೆದರು.

ಅವರು ಸಂಸ್ಕೃತದಲ್ಲಿ ಅನೇಕ ಕೃತಿಗಳನ್ನು ರಚಿಸಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅವರ ಪ್ರಮುಖ ಕೃತಿಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಶ್ಲೋಕಮಂಜರಿ, ಸುಭಾಷಿತ ಸುಧಾ ಮತ್ತು ಕಾವ್ಯಾಲಂಕಾರ ಸಂಗ್ರಹ ಸೇರಿವೆ. ಅವರ ಕೃತಿಗಳು ಸರಳ ಮತ್ತು ಸುಂದರ ಸಂಸ್ಕೃತ ಶೈಲಿಯಲ್ಲಿವೆ. ಅವರ ಕೃತಿಗಳು ಅನೇಕ ಶಾಲಾ ಕಾಲೇಜುಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಪಠ್ಯಪುಸ್ತಕಗಳಾಗಿ ಬಳಕೆಯಾಗುತ್ತಿವೆ.

ಅವರ ಸಂಸ್ಕೃತ ಸೇವೆಗಾಗಿ ಅವರಿಗೆ ಅನೇಕ ಪ್ರಶಸ್ತಿಗಳು ಸಂದಿವೆ. ೨೦೦೫ರಲ್ಲಿ ಅವರಿಗೆ ರಾಜ್ಯ ಸಂಸ್ಕೃತ ಪಂಡಿತ ಪ್ರಶಸ್ತಿ ಲಭಿಸಿತು. ೨೦೧೦ರಲ್ಲಿ ಅವರಿಗೆ ಜೀವಮಾನ ಸಾಧನೆ ಪ್ರಶಸ್ತಿ ನೀಡಲಾಯಿತು. ಅವರು ಸಂಸ್ಕೃತ ಭಾಷೆಯ ಉಳಿವಿಗಾಗಿ ಶ್ರಮಿಸಿದ ಮಹಾನ್ ವ್ಯಕ್ತಿ.

Gen. Serial No. 32.]

189.

No. 747

Name of Petitioner.

Village.

Tahsil.

District.

Date of Arz.

Date of Receipt.

Date of Dispos.

No. of Enclosures. 4

ABSTRACT.

conducting the duties of the office of [illegible] of [illegible] [illegible] with the [illegible] died in 1877. One Ramappa who was quite unconnected with the said Ramappa [illegible] falsely setting up his claim rejecting the petitioners out of the office. The Revenue Division [illegible] [illegible] with office were in that [illegible] - which their claim to the office was pending settlement the above [illegible] [illegible] were [illegible] during [illegible] settlement. Ramappa having [illegible] to [illegible] them [illegible] in the Police they submitted a petition to the [illegible] in 18[illegible] - [illegible] [illegible] till 1893 - when they were granted an endorsement stating that the matter could not be disposed of summarily -

4. They then filed a suit in the [illegible] [illegible] Court [illegible] [illegible] decided against them. They then submitted a revision petition which was rejected. On this they appealed to the [illegible] who did not [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] - [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] decided the case against them on all grounds.

5. On 8-12-94 they submitted a revision application - without [illegible] they were granted endorsement No. 1184 of 4-3-95 ~~rejecting~~ [illegible] [illegible] with the previous decision -

6. In the original and appeal suits filed by them the following points have to be [illegible]:

(1). That the suit is not barred by limitation -

(2) That the [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] by not [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] is not [illegible] for the confirmation of the [illegible].

(3) That the [illegible] of [illegible] submitted report No. 4820 of 9-12-92 reporting that according to the custom prevailing in the [illegible] [illegible] the [illegible] might also be allowed to conduct the duties of the office of [illegible] [illegible]. The dismissal of the appeal is not consistent with the above report [illegible] with the custom prevailing in the [illegible] - [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] claim -

4. That the respondent is not an adoptive [illegible] -

5. That the claim is [illegible] by the [illegible] of the Revenue Division [illegible]. Consequently the respondent's claim should not be [illegible] [illegible].

30/8

ہے کہ اس کے ساتھ ہی ایک اور مقدمہ بھی دائر کیا گیا تھا جس میں مدعی نے اپنے
حق میں ڈگری حاصل کر لی ہے۔ اس مقدمہ کی ڈگری کے خلاف بھی اپیل دائر کی گئی
ہے۔ اس مقدمہ کی اپیل کی سماعت کے وقت اپیل کنندہ کے وکیل نے یہ دلیل پیش کی
کہ اس مقدمہ کی ڈگری کے خلاف اپیل کی سماعت کے وقت اپیل کنندہ کے وکیل نے
یہ دلیل پیش کی کہ اس مقدمہ کی ڈگری کے خلاف اپیل کی سماعت کے وقت اپیل
کنندہ کے وکیل نے یہ دلیل پیش کی کہ اس مقدمہ کی ڈگری کے خلاف اپیل کی
سماعت کے وقت اپیل کنندہ کے وکیل نے یہ دلیل پیش کی کہ اس مقدمہ کی ڈگری
کے خلاف اپیل کی سماعت کے وقت اپیل کنندہ کے وکیل نے یہ دلیل پیش کی کہ

33

(12)

ನಂಬರ್ 941

L. R. 119-94-11

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] 4 [illegible]

[illegible]

24-9-95

By Order

Under Secretary

1-10-95